



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/055,011	01/25/2002	Laurence Edward LaForge	24896	8084

20529 7590 09/24/2004

NATH & ASSOCIATES
1030 15th STREET, NW
6TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/055,011

Applicant(s)

LAFORGE ET AL.

Examiner

James H Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 May 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/25/02
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Celik (U.S. Patent No. 6,374,259).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Celik teaches that in a first step (110), a user (hereinafter User 1) of the first personal computer (12) accesses the remote computer over the internet to input business contact information of User 1 or other information that User 1 wishes to store in the database (18). In response, in step (120), the remote computer (16) establishes an account for User 1, stores the contact information for User 1 in the database (18), and provides a unique identification number for User 1. The database (18) may contain contact information for a number of users each of whom is assigned a unique identification number (Col. 4, lines 11-22; compare with Claim 1, “... ***means for capturing contact information, or information pertinent to computer applications which process such information***”). Celik also teaches that in step 130, User 1 (or a commercial printer selected by User 1) prints business cards for User 1 containing the unique identification number (Col. 4, lines 23-25). In one embodiment, in place of, or in addition to the unique identification number, a bar code, or some other

code representative of the unique identification number, may be printed on the business card. Fig. 3 shows a business card (30) having a bar code (32), representative of the identification number, printed on the back, and having the unique identification number (34), identified as a OnePIN™ number, printed on the front and on the back (Col. 4, lines 27-35; compare with Claim 1, “... ***digitizing said information into a master image, copies of which are suitable for printing onto paper stock***”). Celik does not teach encoding the contact information directly into the barcode, but rather making it possible to scan the barcode at a later time and retrieve the contact information by use of a unique ID number related to the contact information. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use this method over the claimed method, since both lead to the same contact information. The benefit of using Celik's method would have been to provide for more security for the contact information.

In regard to independent Claim 2, Celik teaches that in step 150 of the method (100), User 2 enters the unique identification number of User 1 into the second computer (14). User 2 can enter the unique identification number by typing the OnePIN™ number or by scanning the number into the synchronizer of the second personal computer using a wand, or some other bar code reader, coupled to the second personal computer (14). User 2 also can type in or scan the OnePIN™ number into PIM. As discussed below, the identification number is stored in the synchronizer and in the PIM of the second personal computer. The synchronizer and the PIM may already contain identification numbers for users of the contact management system other than

User 1 (Col. 4, lines 51-63; compare with Claim 2, “... ***means for scanning an image of digitized contact information, converting and transferring that information into a PIM, or into computer applications which process such information***”).

In regard to dependent Claim 3, Celik teaches that in a first step (110), a user (hereinafter User 1) of the first personal computer (12) accesses the remote computer over the internet to input business contact information of User 1 or other information that User 1 wishes to store in the database (18). In response, in step (120), the remote computer (16) establishes an account for User 1, stores the contact information for User 1 in the database (18), and provides a unique identification number for User 1. The database (18) may contain contact information for a number of users each of whom is assigned a unique identification number (Col. 4, lines 11-22; compare with Claim 3, “... ***with digital forms or stationery in addition to business cards***”).

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Celik teaches that in step 150 of the method (100), User 2 enters the unique identification number of User 1 into the second computer (14). User 2 can enter the unique identification number by typing the OnePIN™ number or by scanning the number into the synchronizer of the second personal computer using a wand, or some other bar code reader, coupled to the second personal computer (14). User 2 also can type in or scan the OnePIN™ number into PIM. As discussed below, the identification number is stored in the synchronizer and in the PIM of the second personal computer. The synchronizer and the PIM may already contain identification numbers for users of the contact management system other than User 1 (Col. 4, lines 51-63). In addition, Celik teaches that in other embodiments, the

user's unique identification number may be contained on documents other than business cards such as on letterhead for the user's business or on a user's resume, and may also be contained within e-mails and other electronic documents such as a card (Col. 10, lines 39-44; compare with Claim 4, "... **with digital forms or stationery in addition to business cards**").

In regard to dependent Claim 5, Celik also teaches that in step 130, User 1 (or a commercial printer selected by User 1) prints *business cards* for User 1 containing the unique identification number (Col. 4, lines 23-25). In one embodiment, in place of, or in addition to the unique identification number, a bar code, or some other code representative of the unique identification number, may be printed on the business card. Fig. 3 shows a business card (30) having a bar code (32), representative of the identification number, printed on the back, and having the unique identification number (34), identified as a OnePIN™ number, printed on the front and on the back (Col. 4, lines 27-35; compare with Claim 5, "**A substantially interchangeable representation of the information and image recited in Claim 3**").

In regard to dependent Claim 6, Celik teaches that the method provides a unique identification number for User 1, and that the number can be represented by a barcode (Col. 4, lines 23-25, and lines 27-30; compare with Claim 6, "**The system recited in Claim 3, where the image is that of a bar code**").

In regard to dependent Claim 7, Celik teaches that User 2 can enter the unique identification number by typing the OnePIN™ number or by scanning the number into the synchronizer of the second personal computer using a wand, or some other bar

Art Unit: 2176

code reader, coupled to the second personal computer (14) (Col. 4, lines 55-58; compare with Claim 7, ***“The system recited in Claim 4, where the image is that of a bar code”***).

In regard to dependent Claim 8, Celik teaches in one embodiment, in place of, or in addition to the unique identification number, a bar code, or some other code representative of the unique identification number, may be printed on the business card (Col. 4, lines 27-30; compare with Claim 8, ***“The representation recited in Claim 5, where the image is that of a bar code”***).

Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Celik in view of Reber et al. (hereinafter Reber, U.S. Patent No. 5,930,767).

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Celik does not specifically teach *with a master format in addition to a master image; and that copies of the master format are suitable for rendering onto magnetic or optical media, holographic media, or smart chips.*

However, Reber teaches that the machine-readable data (36) includes a printed code or a human-viewable code, such as a bar code, which encodes the second data element to identify the party in the transaction. The bar code can include a one-dimensional bar code or a two-dimensional bar code. Examples of one-dimensional bar codes include, but are not limited to, 3 of 9, UPC-A, UPC-E, Code 128, Codabar, MSI, Extended 3 of 9, Code 93, Extended Code 93, Industrial 2 of 5, Standard 2 of 5, Code 11, and UCC/EAN-128. Examples of two-dimensional bar codes include, but are not limited to, DataMatrix and PDF417. Although bar codes are human-viewable, they are practically unreadable by many humans (Col. 4, lines 1-13). One needs a master format in order to use such coding schemes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Celik and Reber because both inventions deal with transactions using coded information on card-sized stock. Reber adds the feature of using multiple forms of codes on the same card, including bar codes. The benefit would have been to have bar codes that obey a standard format.

In regard to dependent Claim 10, Celik fails to teach that *in addition to scanning an image, the system may read from magnetic or optical media, holographic media, or*

smart chips. However, Reber teaches a transaction system that uses a card consisting of a substantially flat substrate formed of a dielectric or nonmagnetic material such as paper, cardboard, or plastic. The card (42) is sized for carrying within a wallet, a purse, or a pocket of the end user (26). Preferably, the card (42) is shaped and sized as a credit card or a debit card for this purpose. Alternatively, the card (42) can have shapes and sizes of other cards, including but not limited to, a business card, a smart card, an index card, a trading card, or a playing card (Col. 6, lines 42-51). In addition, Reber teaches that the machine-readable data (36) includes a bar code supported by the card (42). The bar code encodes a personal identification code for the end user (26) for performing transactions over the electronic network (22). The first human-readable image (44) includes a logo for the transaction service provided by either the computer (20) or the computer (64) (Col. 6, lines 52-57). Reber also teaches that optionally, the device (40) further serves as a credit card, a debit card, a charge card, or an automatic teller machine (ATM) card. In this case, the card (42) can further support: (i) a name (72) of a party such as the end user (26); (ii) a card number (74) such as a credit card number, a debit card number, a charge card number, or an ATM card number associated with the party; (iii) a hologram (76) for authenticating the device (40) at a point of sale; (iv) a magnetic stripe (not illustrated) on an opposite side of the card (42); and (v) a picture of the end user (26) (Col. 7, lines 4-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Celik and Reber because both inventions deal with transactions using coded information on card-sized stock. Reber adds the feature of using multiple forms of codes on the same

card, including magnetic media. The benefit would have been to have a card whose contents are less fraud-proof.

In regard to dependent Claim 11, Celik does not teach that *in addition, the interchange subsumes magnetic or optical media, holographic media or smart chips*. However, Reber teaches a transaction system that uses a card consisting of a substantially flat substrate formed of a dielectric or nonmagnetic material such as paper, cardboard, or plastic. The card (42) is sized for carrying within a wallet, a purse, or a pocket of the end user (26). Preferably, the card (42) is shaped and sized as a credit card or a debit card for this purpose. Alternatively, the card (42) can have shapes and sizes of other cards, including but not limited to, a business card, a smart card, an index card, a trading card, or a playing card (Col. 6, lines 42-51). In addition, Reber teaches that the machine-readable data (36) includes a bar code supported by the card (42). The bar code encodes a personal identification code for the end user (26) for performing transactions over the electronic network (22). The first human-readable image (44) includes a logo for the transaction service provided by either the computer (20) or the computer (64) (Col. 6, lines 52-57). Reber also teaches that optionally, the device (40) further serves as a credit card, a debit card, a charge card, or an automatic teller machine (ATM) card. In this case, the card (42) can further support: (i) a name (72) of a party such as the end user (26); (ii) a card number (74) such as a credit card number, a debit card number, a charge card number, or an ATM card number associated with the party; (iii) a hologram (76) for authenticating the device (40) at a point of sale; (iv) a magnetic stripe (not illustrated) on an opposite side of the card (42);

Art Unit: 2176

and (v) a picture of the end user (26) (Col. 7, lines 4-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Celik and Reber because both inventions deal with transactions using coded information on card-sized stock. Reber adds the feature of using multiple forms of codes on the same card, including magnetic media. The benefit would have been to have a card whose contents are less fraud-proof.

In regard to dependent Claim 12, Celik teaches bar codes (Col. 4, lines 23-25, and lines 27-30; compare with Claim 12, “... ***where the image is that of a bar code***”).

In regard to dependent Claim 13, Celik teaches bar codes (Col. 4, lines 23-25, and lines 27-30; compare with Claim 13, “... ***where the image is that of a bar code***”).

In regard to dependent Claim 14, Celik teaches bar codes (Col. 4, lines 23-25, and lines 27-30; compare with Claim “... ***where the image is that of a bar code***”).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
09/17/04


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER